All communications respecting this case should identify it by number and names of parties.



# UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: BOX INTERFERENCE

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Telephone: (703) 308-9797 Facsimile: (703) 308-7953

# MAILED

APR 2 3 1998

PAT. & T.M. OFFICE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES Applicants: Goicoechea et al.

Serial No.: 08/461,402

Filed: 06/05/95

Title: BIFURCATED ENDOLUMINAL

PROSTHESIS

Accorded Benefit of: European Applications EP9440284.9 filed 02/09/94 and EP94401306.9 filed 06/10/94; and U.S. Serial No. 08/317,763 filed 10/04/94, now Patent No. 5,609,627 issued

03/11/97

The case referred to above has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences because it is adjudged to interfere with other cases hereafter specified. Attention is directed to the fact that this interference is declared pursuant to 37 CFR 1.601 et seq., effective February 11, 1985 (49 F.R. 48416. 1050 O.G. 385). The interference is designated as No. 104,083.

By direction of the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks and as required by 35 USC 135(c), notice is hereby given the parties of the requirement of the law for filing in the Patent and Trademark Office a copy of any agreement "in connection with or in contemplation of the termination of the interference."

Attachment
(37 CFR § 1.611(c))

The cases involved in this interference are:

JUNIOR PARTY

Patentee: Eric C. Martin

134 Old Post Road North Croton on Hudson, NY 10520

Patent: 5,575,817 issued 11/19/96, Serial No.

08/293,541 filed 08/19/94

Title: AORTO FEMORAL BIFURCATION GRAFT AND METHOD OF

IMPLANTATION

Assignees: None

Attorney(s): Robert J. Koch

Associate Attorney(s): None

Accorded Benefit of: None

Correspondence Address: Robert J. Koch

Fulbright and Jaworski 801 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004

SENIOR PARTY

Applicants: George Goicoechea

P.O. Box F-44289

Freeport, Grand Bahama, Bahamas

John Hudson

1 Salcombe Drive

Glenfield, Leicester LE3 8AG, England

Claude Mialhe

Av. Pierre Brossolette 83300 Draguignan, France Andrew H. Cragg

4502 Edina Boulevard Edina, Minnesota 55424

Michael D. Dake 665 Gerona Road Standford, CA 94305

Application:

08/461,402 filed 06/05/95

Title:

BIFURCATED ENDOLUMINAL PROSTHESIS

Assignees:

Boston Scientific Technology, Inc.,

A Minnesota Corporation

Attorney(s):

Paul F. Prestia, Allan Ratner, Andrew L. Ney,

Kenneth N. Nigon, Kevin R. Casey, Guy T. Donatiello, Benjamin E. Leace, James C. Simmons, Viviana Amzel, Lawrence E. Ashery,

Christopher R. Lewis, Steven E. Koffs,

Anthony L. Dibartolomeo, Allan M. Wheatcraft,

Anthony Grillo and Leon Nigohosian, Jr.

Associate Attorney(s): None

Accorded Benefit of:

European Applications EP9440284.9 filed

02/09/94 and EP94401306.9 filed

06/10/94; and U.S. Serial No. 08/317,763 filed 10/04/94, now Patent No. 5,609,627

issued 03/11/97

Correspondence Address:

Paul F. Prestia Ratner & Prestia 500 N Gulph Road

P.O. Box 980

Valley Forge, PA 19482

#### Count 1

An apparatus for reinforcing a bifurcated lumen comprising:

a first section, configured to be positioned within the lumen, comprising:

an upper limb, configured to fit within the lumen upstream of the bifurcation;

a first lower limb, configured to extend into a first leg of said bifurcation when said first section is positioned in the lumen, and

a second lower limb, shorter than said first lower limb, and configured so that when said first section is positioned in the lumen, said second lower limb does not extend into a second leg of said bifurcation.

The claims of the parties which correspond to this

count are:

Martin

: Claim 1

Goicoechea et al.: Claim 89

Murriel E. Crawford Administrative Parent Judge

(703) 308-9797

gjh

	This interfe	erence involves	found to exist between the parties	1070	0:
	SERIALHO SE		PARTIE PART	ESSUE DATE (FOR	
		YE	lo Maintenance tees po	i due yet	
phenion has been patented, have maintana corried the benefit of:			[PATENT NO. IF ANY	LISSUE DATE, IF ANY	
UNTRY	SERIAL NO.	FILING DATE	TAIL THE THE THE THE TAIL THE TAIL THE TAIL THE THE THE THE THE THE THE THE		
·	·				
	·				
e cisim(s) of this party which conespond(s) is TENTABLE CLAIMS	this count la(are);	UNPATENTABLE CLA			
c daim(s) of this party which does(do) not on TENTABLE CLAIMS	arrespond to this court is(818):	UNPATENTABLE CL	AIMS		
May 2	-1				
an -	SERIOL NO.	FILMGERATE	PATEMENT TO ME	ESUE DATE JE AUT	
CKAGG		Yes	No Marnenance tecs r	ol due yet	
opplication has been patiented, have mointer				ISSUE DATE, IF ANY	
NUNTRY	SCIOCIO.	FILING DATE	PATENT NO., IF ANY		
EPO	EP94400284.9	2/09/94			
EPO	EP9440306.9	6/10/99			
US	08/312,88/	9/27/9	9	2 11/02	-
129	08/317,763	10/04/9	14 5,609,62	7 03/1/97	
he claim(s) of this party which correspond(s)	to this count is(see):	IUNPATENTABLE CL	AIMS		
54,59,63,64,	67	1			
he claim(s) of this party which does(do) not o	correspond to this court ex(s/e);	IUNPATENTABLE CL	AIMS		
62,68		Town Company to the Company of the C	معادات للعاردة والكالمات المتقاردة والمال المتقال والمالية	til formall, sie suttation en Later, fat London and Later, est film, so a	
and the state of t	1 :51 - 5-	Instruction	ins by contacting the MAINTEN	ANCE FEE	
. For every patent involved in the DEPARTMENT at 308-5069.	If fees are due and they have:	not been paid, the	interference cannot be decla	red since it would	
involve an expired patent (35 I 2. For each party, separately ident	ify the palentable and unpate	otable claims which	th correspond to the count.		
				nunt	
<ol> <li>For each party, separately ident</li> <li>(37 CFR.1.609(b)(3)).</li> </ol>	ify the patentable and unpate		ch do not correspond to the c	oun	
Forward all files including thes	e the benefit of which is being	g accorded.			
5 Keen a copy of the Interference	nfarmgfian reducted DCIO¥	A MIGHT DE RIVERIE	7 OT (T) COPT,	nd type-written.	
6. On a separate sheet, set forth a	single proposed interference	count. If any clair	m of any party is exactly the laim number.	same word for word	
7. For each claim designated as of	orresponding to the count, pro	ovide an explanati	on of why cach claim define		
8. For each claim designated as n	ot corresponding to the count 1.609(b)(3)).				
9. For each additional count, if so separate patentable invention	my reneat steps 2-6 and, addit	CK 1.005(DK1)).	<u> </u>	nt représents a	
DATE / PRIMA	RY EXAMINER (Signature)	1	703-308-2490		
12/12/92 101	LA LA UNIVER		105 200 6/10		

there are intervening applications necessary for continuity.

THIS PAGE CAN BE DUPLICATED IF THERE ARE MORE THAN TWO INTERFERING PARTIES.

Page 1 of 2

0.550/Raw 9-27-85)	INTERFERENCE I	NITIAL MEMO	RANDUM	following cases:
OARD OF PATENT APPEA	INTERFERENCE II LIS AND INTERFERENCES. This inte	: An interierence i rference involve	s 10 mm to exist between the s	104083
	Tims ma		PATENT NO. JEWIX	ESUS DATE (SAM:
	SERVICE LAND			
	September (see book 08/07)	_/_Yes	No Maintenance fees pol	due yet
optication has been patented, have ma	\	IFILING DATE	PATENT NO, IF ANY	ISSUE DATE, IF ANY
UNTRY	SERIAL NO.		94	
EPO	FP 944 00284.9			
EPO	EP94401306.9	06/10/	77	
US	08/317,763	10/04	199	
c chaim(s) of this party which correspon TENTABLE CLAIMS		UNPATENTABLE CI	AIM8	
c claim(s) of this party which does(do)	not correspond to this count is(are):	LUNPATENTABLE C	LAIMS	
155,59,62	45,88£90		*	
30,31,05	CERTIFIC NO.	FILMGOATE	PATENT NO. IF ANY	IESUE DAVE JE ART
AN				
application has been patented, have r	mainlanence fees been paid?	Yes	NoMaintenânce tecs no	ot dus yet
Accorded the benefit of:	ISERIAL NO.	FILING DATE	PATENT NO., IF ANY	ISSUE DATE, IF ANY
OUNTRY	3LIGENS.			
			· ·	
The claim(s) of this party which correspond to the claims  The claim(s) of this party which does (6) party which d	ol uor coulesboud to this coning cr(si.e.):	IUNPATENTABLE (		
	The second secon	And the latter of the latter o	an italian sa manan matanasaha, ami samatahan samata samata	المواقعة ومعاري المقافقين ماري وجها فالمقاف والماقة والمتاف والماقة والمتافة والمتافة والمتافة والمتافة والمتا
and a second and the second se		Instruct	the contacting the MAINTEN	ANCE FEE
DEPARTMENT at 308-50	069. If 1665 are due and mey ha	0).		ed since it would
? For each narty, separately	identify the patentable and unpr	atentable claims wh	nich correspond to the count.	
	(n), 1.609(b)(2)). identify the patentable and unp			ount
(37 CFR 1.609(b)(3)).				
4 Forward all files including	g those the benefit of which is b	eing accorded.		
	rence Initial Memorandum and			nd type-written.
" . Alia assent mlanco india	orth a single proposed interferen	con count. If any claration	aim of any purty is exactly the security the security in the s	same word for word
7. For each claim designated	d as corresponding to the count,	provide an explana	MIOD OF WHY CACH CIAIM GOVING	
18. For each claim designate	d as not corresponding to the co CFR 1.609(b)(3)).			
la F L. Jáirianal agus	t, if any, repeat steps 2-6 and, action from every other count (37	dditionally, provider CFR 1.609(b)(1)).		TART UNIT
DATE // / / / /	PRIMARY EXAMINER (SIGNALITE)	0-	703-308-2496	3308
/2//2/97	GROUP DIRECTOR SIGNATURE (I requ	ired)	ns 20 - 110	
	. •			·
The sens mumber and filling date of	f each application the benefit of which is to	ntended to be accorded o	nust be tissed. It is not sufficient to mare	y list the earliest

# Count 1:

An apparatus for reinforcing a bifurcated lumen comprising:

a first section, configured to be positioned within the lumen, comprising:

an upper limb, configured to fit within the lumen upstream of the bifurcation;

- a first lower limb, configured to extend into a first leg of said bifurcation when said first section is positioned in the lumen, and
- a second lower limb, shorter than said first lower limb, and configured so that when said first section is positioned in the lumen, said second lower limb does not extend into a second leg of said bifurcation.

This count is exactly the same as claim 1 of Martin, US Patent 5,575,817, and claim 89 of Cragg, Appl. 08/461,402.

The important feature of this count is that the bifurcated prosthesis has two limbs but only one limb extends across the bifurcation and into the lumen of the vessel.

# Count 2:

An apparatus for reinforcing a bifurcated lumen comprising:

a first section, configured to be positioned within the lumen, comprising:

an upper limb, configured to fit within the lumen upstream of the bifurcation;

a first lower limb, configured to extend into a first leg of said bifurcation when said first section is positioned in the lumen, and

a second lower limb, shorter than said first lower limb, and configured so that when said first section is positioned in the lumen, said second lower limb does not extend into a second leg of said bifurcation, and further comprising

a second section configured to be positioned separately within the lumen and joined to said second lower limb of the first section, effectively extending said second lower limb into said second leg of said bifurcation.

This count is exactly the same as claim 2 of Martin, US Patent 5,575,817, and claim 90 of Cragg, Appl. 08/461,402.

# Distinction between Counts 1 and 2.

The important feature of count 1 is that the bifurcated prosthesis has two limbs but only one limb extends across the bifurcation and into the lumen of the vessel. Count 2 requires an additional stent to be added to the short limb, thus making a two piece graft that extends into both branches of the vessel. The count 2 is patentably distinct from count 1 for this reason.

# A) Why claims correspond to Count 1.

- 1) Martin, US Patent 5,575,817: Claim 1 of the patent is identical to the count.
- 2) Cragg, application 08/461,402: Claim 89 of Cragg '402 is identical to the count.
- 3) Cragg, application 08/463,987: Claims 54, 59\*, 63,64 and 67 of Cragg '987 correspond to the count.

Independent claim 54 defines a method for delivering a bifurcated prosthesis. The prosthesis which is implanted into the vessel is bifurcated, thus having two limbs or distal stent portions, but only one limb extends across the bifurcation and into the branch lumen of the vessel. The implanted prosthesis is the main feature of the claim. The remaining method steps of claim 54 are well know in the art. The claim would be rejected if the count was available as prior art.

Independent claim 59\* defines a bifurcated prosthesis with first and second distal stent portions (analogous to the "two limbs" of the count) but only one distal stent portion extends across the bifurcation and into the branched lumen of the vessel. Claim 59\* further recites a graft layer on the bifurcated stent. Such a graft layer is well know in the art and the claim would be rejected if the count was available as prior art.

Independent claim 63 recite a method for delivering a bifurcated prosthesis. The resultant prosthesis which is implanted into the vessel is bifurcated, thus having two limbs or distal stent portions, but only one limb extends across the bifurcation and into the branch lumen of the vessel. The implanted prosthesis is the main feature of the claim. Claim 63 differs slightly from the count in that the prosthesis of claim 63 if formed from two distinct pieces. When assembled according

<sup>\*</sup>as filed in the After Final Amendment of 9/2/97 and stated as allowable over the cited prior art if filed in a separate amendment

to the method, the resultant prosthesis meets the limitations of the count. The claim would be rejected as obvious if the count was available as prior art.

Independent claims 65 and 67 recite a bifurcated prosthesis. The assembled prosthesis is bifurcated, thus having two limbs or distal stent portions, but only one limb extends across the bifurcation and into the branch lumen of the vessel. The implanted prosthesis is the main feature of the claim. The claims differs slightly from the count in that the prosthesis of the claims is formed from two distinct pieces. When assembled according to the claims, the resultant prosthesis meets the limitations of the count. The claim would be rejected as obvious if the count was available as prior art.

Dependent claim 64 does not recite a patentable distinct feature or method and the claim would be rejected if the count was available as prior art

#### B) Why claims do not correspond to Count 1.

- 1) Martin, US Patent 5,575,817: Claims 2-17 of the patent do not correspond to the count. Claim 2 recites a separate patentable invention in that a second section is added to the shorter lower limb to extend the shorter second lower limb into the branched lumen of the vessel.
- 2) Cragg, application 08/461,402: Claims 55, 59, 62-65, 88 and 90 of Cragg '402 do not correspond to the count. The claims recite a separate patentable invention in that a second section is added to the shorter distal portion (analogous to the lower limb of the count) to extend the shorter second distal portion into the branched lumen of the vessel.
- 3) Cragg, application 08/463,987: Claims 62, 66 and 68 of Cragg '987 do not correspond to the count. The claims recite that a second section is added to the shorter distal portion

(analogous to the lower limb of the count) to extend the shorter second distal portion into the branched lumen of the vessel.

# C) Why claims correspond to Count 2.

- 1) Martin, US Patent 5,575,817: Claim 2 of the patent is identical to the count. Claims 3-17 do not recite patentable, distinct features and the claims would be rejected if the count was available as prior art.
- 2) Cragg, application 08/312,881: Claims 1-9, 11, 12, 63, 64, 66, 68-71, 73-84 correspond to the count.

Independent claims 1, 11, 63, 66 and 80 correspond to the count since a second section is added to the shorter distal portion (analogous to the second lower limb of the count) to extend the shorter second distal portion into the branched lumen of the vessel.

Claims 2-9, 12, 64, 68-71, 73-79 and 81-84 do not recite patentable, distinct features and the claims would be rejected if the count was available as prior art.

3) Cragg, application 08/461,402: Claims 55, 59, 62-65, 88 and 90 of Cragg '402 correspond to the count.

Claim 90 is identical to the count.

Independent claim 55 defines a method for delivering a bifurcated prosthesis. The prosthesis which is implanted into the vessel is bifurcated, thus having two limbs or distal stent portions, with one limb extending across the bifurcation and into the branch lumen of the vessel and a second section added to the shorter distal portion (analogous to the second lower limb of the count) to extend the shorter second distal portion into the branched lumen of the vessel. The implanted prosthesis is the main feature of the claim. The remaining method steps of claim 55 are well know in the art and would be rejected as obvious if the count was available as prior art.

Independent claim 59 recites a bifurcated prosthesis with a second section added to the

shorter distal portion (analogous to the second lower limb of the count) to extend the shorter second distal portion into the branched lumen of the vessel. This structure is identical, although worded differently, to the count.

Claims 62-65 and 88 do not recite patentable, distinct features and the claims would be rejected if the count was available as prior art.

4) Cragg, application 08/463,987: Claims 62, and 68 of Cragg '987 correspond to count 2.

Claims 62, and 68 recite a bifurcated prosthesis with a second section added to the shorter distal portion (analogous to the second lower limb of the count) to extend the shorter second distal portion into the branched lumen of the vessel. This structure is identical, although worded differently, to the count. Claim 68 further recites a graft layer on the bifurcated stent.

Such a graft layer is well know in the art and the claim would be rejected as obvious if the count was available as prior art.

5) Fogarty, application 08/463,836: Claims 27-69 correspond to count 2.

Independent claim 27 recites a method for forming a bifurcated structure with a first section (graft) added to one leg/connector section of the bifurcated structure forming a bifurcated prosthesis having two limbs but only one limb extends across the bifurcation and into the lumen of the vessel. The second section is then added to the shorter lower limb of the resultant bifurcated prosthesis to extend the shorter limb into the branched lumen of the vessel. The structure is the patentable feature of the method claim. This resultant structure is identical, although worded differently, to the count.

Independent claim 41 recites a method for introducing a bifurcated graft with a second

section added to the shorter second lower limb to extend the shorter second lower limb into the branched lumen of the vessel. The structure is the patentable feature of the method claim. This structure is identical, although worded differently, to the count.

Claims 28-40 and 42-69 do not recite patentable, distinct features and the claims would be rejected if the count was available as prior art.

#### D) Why claims do not correspond to Count 2.

1) Martin, US Patent 5,575,817: Claim 1 of the patent does not correspond to count 2.

The important feature of claim 1 is that the bifurcated prosthesis has two limbs but only one limb extends across the bifurcation and into the lumen of the vessel. Count 2 requires an additional stent to be added to the short limb, thus making a two piece graft that extends into both branches of the vessel. The count 2 is patentably distinct from Martin's claim 1 for this reason.

2) Cragg, application 08/312,881: Claims 13-17 and 38 do not correspond to the count.

Claims 13-17 and 38 merely recite a bifurcated stent with a graft layer. The first and second distal stent portions are integral with the proximal stent portion and will simultaneously extend into the branches of the vessel when the proximal portion is deployed. Count 2 requires an additional stent to be added to the short limb, thus making a two piece prosthesis that extends into both branches of the vessel.

3) Cragg, application 08/461,402: Claim 89 of Cragg '402 does not correspond to the count.

The important feature of claim 89 is that the bifurcated prosthesis has two limbs but only one limb extends across the bifurcation and into the lumen of the vessel. Count 2 requires an additional stent to be added to the short limb, thus making a two piece graft that extends into both

branches of the vessel. The count 2 is patentably distinct from the Cragg '402 claim 89 for this reason.

4) Cragg, application 08/463,987: Claims 54, 59, 63, 64 and 67 of Cragg '987 do not correspond to the count.

The important feature of claims is that the bifurcated prosthesis has two limbs but only one limb extends across the bifurcation and into the lumen of the vessel. Count 2 requires an additional stent to be added to the short limb, thus making a two piece graft that extends into both branches of the vessel. The count 2 is patentably distinct from the Cragg '987 claims for this reason.

5) Fogarty, application 08/463,836: All claims correspond to count 2.

MICHAEL J. MILANO PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 3500

PTO-650(Ren. 9-27-95)  ROARD OF PATENT APPEALS A	INTERFERENCE IN	TIAL MEMO	RANDUM s found to exis	t between the follow	ving cases:	
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS A	This inter	ference involve	s <u>5</u> pa	rties	107089	
It application has been parented, have maintana	SERIAC NO.			lehntenance tees not due y	d	
if application has been parameted in the community of country	SERIAL NO.	FILING DATE	PATE	NT NO, IF ANY	ISSUE DATE, IF ANY	
3	·					
					·	
The desim(s) of this party which correspond(s) to PATENTABLE CLAIMS	trais count (2(272):	UNPATENTABLE CL	AIMS			
The claim(s) of this party which does(do) not co PATENTABLE CLAIMS	rrespond to this court is(sre):	UNPATENTABLE CI	LAIMS			
	Carrage	FILINGOALE	PAG	nt no "If any	ISSUE DAYS JE ANY	
CRES		66/95V	No	Maintenance tees not due	yet	
If application has been patented, here maintan "Accorded the banefit of:	\ /			ENT NO., IF ANY	ISSUE DATE, IF ANY	
COUNTRY	SERIAL NO.	FILING DATE	su l'aii	404 1004 10		
EPO	EP94406284.9	2/01/1	194			
EPO	EP 94401306.9	1 9/27	194			
US	08/317,763	10/04	1/94 6	,609,627	03/11/97	
The claim(a) of this party which correspond(a) PATENTABLE CLAIMS		IUNPATENTABLE C		<del>                                     </del>		
The claim(s) of this party which does (do) not o	L	1				
PATENTABLE CLAIMS  54,59,63	3,64,67	IUNPATENTABLE (		and the second s	والمتفاقية والعداري والمتفاقية والمعارض المعاقبين المتفاقية المتفاقية والمتفاقية	
And the second section of the second section secti		Instruct	Lby contacting	the MAINTENANC	e fer	
1. For every patent involved in the DEPARTMENT at 308-5069. I	If fees are due and mey have isc 135(a)-37 CFR 1.606).	o Hot need band on			nce it would	
involve an expired patent (35 USC 135(a); 37 CFR 1.606).  12. For each party, separately identify the patentable and unpatentable claims which correspond to the count.  (37 CFR 1.601 (f), 1.601 (n), 1.609(b)(2)).						
3. For each party, separately identify the patentable and unpatentable claims which its not correspond to the continue of the patentable and unpatentable claims which its not correspond to the continue of the patentable and unpatentable claims which its not correspond to the continue of the patentable and unpatentable claims which its not correspond to the continue of the patentable and unpatentable claims which its not correspond to the continue of the patentable and unpatentable claims which its not correspond to the continue of the patentable and unpatentable claims which its not correspond to the continue of the patentable and unpatentable claims which its not correspond to the continue of						
4 Forward all files including those the benefit of which is being accorded.						
5 Keep a conv of the Interference Initial Memorandum and any attachments for your records.  All information requested below must be attached on (a) separate sheet(s) and type-written.						
16. On a separate sheet, set forth a single proposed interference count. If any claim of any party is exactly the same word for word as this count, please indicate the party, application or patent number, and the claim number.  7. For each claim designated as corresponding to the count, provide an explanation of why each claim defines the same patentable						
7. For each claim designated as of	nitesponding to the count, p	covide an explana	tion of why can	n cixim delines uic		
18. For each claim designated as n patentable invention (37 CFR.)	۱.6U <del>)(</del> ۵)(۵)).					
9. For each additional count, if so separate patentable invention f	tom every own count (3)	попацу, provide CFR 1.609(b)(1)).	TELEPHONE NO.		ARTUNII	
12/12/97 The	ecal Mile	mo_	703-	308-2496	3308	
	DIRECTOR SIGNATURE (If require					
The sens number and filing date of each	application the benefit of which is link	anded to be accorded in	vust be listed. It is n	ot autilicient to marely lest U	e earliest	

Count# Z

INTERFERENCE INITIAL MEMORANDUM

BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES: An interference is found to exist between the following cases: PTO-650-(Rev. 9-27-95) parties This interference involves 5 ATENT NO JE AVE Maintenance fees not due yet Yc If application has been paterned, have maintenance (see been paid? ISSUE DATE, IF ANY Accorded the benefit of PATENT NO. IF ANY FILING DATE COUNTRY The claim(s) of this party which correspond(s) to this count to(are): INPATENTABLE CLAIMS PATENTABLE CLAIMS 55,59,62-65,88,00 ßοß UNPATENTABLE CLAIMS PATENTABLE CLAIMS PATENT NO. TEANY auntemance tees not due yet f application has been patent Accorded the benefit of ISSUE DATE, IF ANY PATENT NO., IF ANY FILING DATE COUNTRY The claim(s) of this party whi IUNPATENTABLE CLAIMS PATENTABLE CLAIMS IUNPATENTABLE CLAIMS PATENTABLE CLAIMS Instructions 1. For every patent involved in the interference, check if the fees have been paid by contacting the MAINTENANCE FEE. DEPARTMENT at 308-5069. If fees are due and they have not been paid, the interference cannot be declared since it would involve an expired patent (35 USC 135(a); 37 CFR 1.606). 2. For each party, separately identify the palentable and unpatentable claims which correspond to the count. (37 CFR 1.601 (f), 1.601 (n), 1.609(b)(2)). 3. For each party, separately identify the patentable and unpatentable claims which do not correspond to the count (37 CFR 1.609(b)(3)). Forward all files including those the benefit of which is being accorded. 5. Keen a copy of the Interference Initial Memorandum and any attachments for your records. All information requested below must be attached on (a) separate sheet(s) and type-written. 6. On a separate sheet, set forth a single proposed interference count. If any claim of any party is exactly the same word for word as this count, please indicate the party, application or patent number, and the claim number. 7. For each claim designated as corresponding to the count, provide an explanation of why each claim defines the same patentable invention (37 CFR 1.609(b)(2)). 18. For each claim designated as not corresponding to the count, provide an explanation of why each claim defines a separate patentable invention (37 CFR 1.609(b)(3)). 19. For each additional count, if any, repeat steps 2-6 and, additionally, provide an explanation why each count represents a separate patentable invention from every other count (37 CFR 1.609(b)(1)). PRIMARY EXAMINER (SIGNALE) GROUP DIRECTOR SIGNATURE (II required) The sensi number and kiling date of each application the benefit of which is Intended to be accorded must be tested. It is not sufficient to merely list the earliest application if there are intervening applications necessary for continuity.

-		TTIAT MENAC	RANDII	М	Count#		
170-esd (ron 9-27-25) BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS A	INTERFERENCE IN	IAL MEMO	found to	exist between the follow	ing cases:		
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS A	ND INTERPERENCES: 7	erence involve	s 5	parties			
	This interi	erence myer	************	ATENT HOE HAVE	SIGNATURAN.	=	
	SERIOR PROPERTY AND A	FILINGEALE	2	ALL	State Control of the		
FORRES	OF 1-100 1-000	06/07/	No -	Maintenance fees not due yet			
application has been patented, have maintenant	not tees born pald?	Yes			SSUE DATE, IF ANY		
Accorded the benefit of:		FILING DATE		PATENT NO, IF ANY	SUE DATE II ANT	┪	
COUNTRY	08/255.68/	6/8/9	4			긤	
<u>us</u>	00/200/20	,				니	
						╝	
			<del></del> †				
						_	
The claim(s) of this party which correspond(s) to	this count la(are);	UNPATENTABLE CL	aims				
PATENTABLE CLAIMS 27-69						_	
The daim(s) of this party which does(do) not con	respond to this count is(BTB):		AIMS	•			
PATENTABLE CLAIMS		UNPATENTABLE CL	JA1192.3	•			
			***************************************	PATENERO: JEANN	ESUE DATE ANY	*****	
PARY	SERIAL NO	FILMOCOALE				*****	
		- Man	No	Maintenance tecs not due y	et		
if application has been patented, have meintane	ance fees been paid?	Yes			ISSUE DATE, IF ANY		
**Accorded the benefit of: COUNTRY	SERIAL NO.	FILING DATE		PATENT NO., IF ANY	ISSUE UNIE, IF ANI	_	
COONIKT							
	-						
		<del>                                     </del>					
The claim(a) of this party which correspond(s) to	o this count is(are):	IUNPATENTABLE C	LAIMS				
PATENTABLE CLAIMS		1					
The claim(s) of this party which does(do) not o	occaspond to this count is(are):	IUNPATENTABLE C	PAILA				
PATENTABLE CLAIMS		Į.			and the second s	, :, **.	
And the state of t	radi pare dia seria di alemania di antica del mandi di antica del mandi di antica di antica di antica di antica	Indensi	ione	man a pala a mili a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a			
		1 b oold	La contact	ing the MAINTENANCE	FEE		
1. For every patent involved in the DEPARTMENT at 308-5069. I	f fees are due and they have	not been paid, th	c interferci	nce cannot be declared sin	ce it would		
2 For each party, separately identify the patentable and unpatentable claims which correspond is the country							
(37 CFR 1.601 (f), 1.601 (n), 1.609(b)(2)).							
13. For each party, separately identify the patentable and unpatentable claims which an not correspond to							
! G7 CER 1 G09(b)(3)).							
4. Forward all files including those the benefit of which is being accorded.							
5. Keep a copy of the Interference Initial Memorandum and any attachments for your records.  All information requested below must be attached on (a) separate sheet(s) and type-written.							
All information requested below must be attached on (a) party is exactly the same word for word  16. On a separate sheet, set forth a single proposed interference count. If any claim of any party is exactly the same word for word  16. On a separate sheet, set forth a single proposed interference count. If any claim of any party is exactly the same word for word  16. On a separate sheet, set forth a single proposed interference count. If any claim of any party is exactly the same word for word  16. On a separate sheet, set forth a single proposed interference count. If any claim of any party is exactly the same word for word  16. On a separate sheet, set forth a single proposed interference count. If any claim of any party is exactly the same word for word  16. On a separate sheet, set forth a single proposed interference count.							
as this count, please motetale the party, approximate or provide an explanation of why each claim defines the same patentable.  7. For each claim designated as corresponding to the count, provide an explanation of why each claim defines the same patentable.							
invention (37 CFR 1.609(b)(2)).  18. For each claim designated as not corresponding to the count, provide an explanation of why each claim defines a separate							
I was to be investigated (37 CFR )	1						
	and sidd	itionally, provide	an explan	ation why cach count repr	esents a		
Congrete ratentable myention if	town cach of the comme (2)	FR 1.609(b)(1)).	TELEPHONE		CATACON IN THE CATACO	_	
DATE A A PRIMAR	Y EXAMINER (Signature)	Pare	2012-	308-2496	3308		
12/12/97 /	ician / /kill	corro	100	200 - 10			
DATE GROUP	DIRECTOR SIGNATURE (I) require	~,			•		
L I	•		1				

Count# 2

# Count 1:

An apparatus for reinforcing a bifurcated lumen comprising:

a first section, configured to be positioned within the lumen, comprising:

an upper limb, configured to fit within the lumen upstream of the bifurcation;

- a first lower limb, configured to extend into a first leg of said bifurcation when said first section is positioned in the lumen, and
- a second lower limb, shorter than said first lower limb, and configured so that when said first section is positioned in the lumen, said second lower limb does not extend into a second leg of said bifurcation.

This count is exactly the same as claim 1 of Martin, US Patent 5,575,817, and claim 89 of Cragg, Appl. 08/461,402.

The important feature of this count is that the bifurcated prosthesis has two limbs but only one limb extends across the bifurcation and into the lumen of the vessel.

# Count 2:

An apparatus for reinforcing a bifurcated lumen comprising:

a first section, configured to be positioned within the lumen, comprising:

an upper limb, configured to fit within the lumen upstream of the bifurcation;

a first lower limb, configured to extend into a first leg of said bifurcation when said first section is positioned in the lumen, and

a second lower limb, shorter than said first lower limb, and configured so that when said first section is positioned in the lumen, said second lower limb does not extend into a second leg of said bifurcation, and further comprising

a second section configured to be positioned separately within the lumen and joined to said second lower limb of the first section, effectively extending said second lower limb into said second leg of said bifurcation.

This count is exactly the same as claim 2 of Martin, US Patent 5,575,817, and claim 90 of Cragg, Appl. 08/461,402.

# Distinction between Counts 1 and 2.

The important feature of count 1 is that the bifurcated prosthesis has two limbs but only one limb extends across the bifurcation and into the lumen of the vessel. Count 2 requires an additional stent to be added to the short limb, thus making a two piece graft that extends into both branches of the vessel. The count 2 is patentably distinct from count 1 for this reason.

# A) Why claims correspond to Count 1.

- 1) Martin, US Patent 5,575,817: Claim 1 of the patent is identical to the count.
- 2) Cragg, application 08/461,402: Claim 89 of Cragg '402 is identical to the count.
- 3) Cragg, application 08/463,987: Claims 54, 59\*, 63,64 and 67 of Cragg '987 correspond to the count.

Independent claim 54 defines a method for delivering a bifurcated prosthesis. The prosthesis which is implanted into the vessel is bifurcated, thus having two limbs or distal stent portions, but only one limb extends across the bifurcation and into the branch lumen of the vessel. The implanted prosthesis is the main feature of the claim. The remaining method steps of claim 54 are well know in the art. The claim would be rejected if the count was available as prior art.

Independent claim 59\* defines a bifurcated prosthesis with first and second distal stent portions (analogous to the "two limbs" of the count) but only one distal stent portion extends across the bifurcation and into the branched lumen of the vessel. Claim 59\* further recites a graft layer on the bifurcated stent. Such a graft layer is well know in the art and the claim would be rejected if the count was available as prior art.

Independent claim 63 recite a method for delivering a bifurcated prosthesis. The resultant prosthesis which is implanted into the vessel is bifurcated, thus having two limbs or distal stent portions, but only one limb extends across the bifurcation and into the branch lumen of the vessel. The implanted prosthesis is the main feature of the claim. Claim 63 differs slightly from the count in that the prosthesis of claim 63 if formed from two distinct pieces. When assembled according

<sup>\*</sup>as filed in the After Final Amendment of 9/2/97 and stated as allowable over the cited prior art if filed in a separate amendment

to the method, the resultant prosthesis meets the limitations of the count. The claim would be rejected as obvious if the count was available as prior art.

Independent claims 65 and 67 recite a bifurcated prosthesis. The assembled prosthesis is bifurcated, thus having two limbs or distal stent portions, but only one limb extends across the bifurcation and into the branch lumen of the vessel. The implanted prosthesis is the main feature of the claim. The claims differs slightly from the count in that the prosthesis of the claims is formed from two distinct pieces. When assembled according to the claims, the resultant prosthesis meets the limitations of the count. The claim would be rejected as obvious if the count was available as prior art.

Dependent claim 64 does not recite a patentable distinct feature or method and the claim would be rejected if the count was available as prior art

## B) Why claims do not correspond to Count 1.

- 1) Martin, US Patent 5,575,817: Claims 2-17 of the patent do not correspond to the count. Claim 2 recites a separate patentable invention in that a second section is added to the shorter lower limb to extend the shorter second lower limb into the branched lumen of the vessel.
- 2) Cragg, application 08/461,402: Claims 55, 59, 62-65, 88 and 90 of Cragg '402 do not correspond to the count. The claims recite a separate patentable invention in that a second section is added to the shorter distal portion (analogous to the lower limb of the count) to extend the shorter second distal portion into the branched lumen of the vessel.
- 3) Cragg, application 08/463,987: Claims 62, 66 and 68 of Cragg '987 do not correspond to the count. The claims recite that a second section is added to the shorter distal portion

(analogous to the lower limb of the count) to extend the shorter second distal portion into the branched lumen of the vessel.

# C) Why claims correspond to Count 2.

- 1) Martin, US Patent 5,575,817: Claim 2 of the patent is identical to the count. Claims 3-17 do not recite patentable, distinct features and the claims would be rejected if the count was available as prior art.
- 2) Cragg, application 08/312,881: Claims 1-9, 11, 12, 63, 64, 66, 68-71, 73-84 correspond to the count.

Independent claims 1, 11, 63, 66 and 80 correspond to the count since a second section is added to the shorter distal portion (analogous to the second lower limb of the count) to extend the shorter second distal portion into the branched lumen of the vessel.

Claims 2-9, 12, 64, 68-71, 73-79 and 81-84 do not recite patentable, distinct features and the claims would be rejected if the count was available as prior art.

3) Cragg, application 08/461,402: Claims 55, 59, 62-65, 88 and 90 of Cragg '402 correspond to the count.

Claim 90 is identical to the count.

Independent claim 55 defines a method for delivering a bifurcated prosthesis. The prosthesis which is implanted into the vessel is bifurcated, thus having two limbs or distal stent portions, with one limb extending across the bifurcation and into the branch lumen of the vessel and a second section added to the shorter distal portion (analogous to the second lower limb of the count) to extend the shorter second distal portion into the branched lumen of the vessel. The implanted prosthesis is the main feature of the claim. The remaining method steps of claim 55 are well know in the art and would be rejected as obvious if the count was available as prior art.

Independent claim 59 recites a bifurcated prosthesis with a second section added to the

shorter distal portion (analogous to the second lower limb of the count) to extend the shorter second distal portion into the branched lumen of the vessel. This structure is identical, although worded differently, to the count.

Claims 62-65 and 88 do not recite patentable, distinct features and the claims would be rejected if the count was available as prior art.

4) Cragg, application 08/463,987: Claims 62, and 68 of Cragg '987 correspond to count 2.

Claims 62, and 68 recite a bifurcated prosthesis with a second section added to the shorter distal portion (analogous to the second lower limb of the count) to extend the shorter second distal portion into the branched lumen of the vessel. This structure is identical, although worded differently, to the count. Claim 68 further recites a graft layer on the bifurcated stent.

Such a graft layer is well know in the art and the claim would be rejected as obvious if the count was available as prior art.

5) Fogarty, application 08/463,836: Claims 27-69 correspond to count 2.

Independent claim 27 recites a method for forming a bifurcated structure with a first section (graft) added to one leg/connector section of the bifurcated structure forming a bifurcated prosthesis having two limbs but only one limb extends across the bifurcation and into the lumen of the vessel. The second section is then added to the shorter lower limb of the resultant bifurcated prosthesis to extend the shorter limb into the branched lumen of the vessel. The structure is the patentable feature of the method claim. This resultant structure is identical, although worded differently, to the count.

Independent claim 41 recites a method for introducing a bifurcated graft with a second

section added to the shorter second lower limb to extend the shorter second lower limb into the branched lumen of the vessel. The structure is the patentable feature of the method claim. This structure is identical, although worded differently, to the count.

Claims 28-40 and 42-69 do not recite patentable, distinct features and the claims would be rejected if the count was available as prior art.

# D) Why claims do not correspond to Count 2.

1) Martin, US Patent 5,575,817: Claim 1 of the patent does not correspond to count 2.

The important feature of claim 1 is that the bifurcated prosthesis has two limbs but only one limb extends across the bifurcation and into the lumen of the vessel. Count 2 requires an additional stent to be added to the short limb, thus making a two piece graft that extends into both branches of the vessel. The count 2 is patentably distinct from Martin's claim 1 for this reason.

2) Cragg, application 08/312,881: Claims 13-17 and 38 do not correspond to the count.

Claims 13-17 and 38 merely recite a bifurcated stent with a graft layer. The first and second distal stent portions are integral with the proximal stent portion and will simultaneously extend into the branches of the vessel when the proximal portion is deployed. Count 2 requires an additional stent to be added to the short limb, thus making a two piece prosthesis that extends into both branches of the vessel.

3) Cragg, application 08/461,402: Claim 89 of Cragg '402 does not correspond to the count.

The important feature of claim 89 is that the bifurcated prosthesis has two limbs but only one limb extends across the bifurcation and into the lumen of the vessel. Count 2 requires an additional stent to be added to the short limb, thus making a two piece graft that extends into both

10

branches of the vessel. The count 2 is patentably distinct from the Cragg '402 claim 89 for this

reason.

4) Cragg, application 08/463,987: Claims 54, 59, 63, 64 and 67 of Cragg '987 do not

correspond to the count.

The important feature of claims is that the bifurcated prosthesis has two limbs but only one

limb extends across the bifurcation and into the lumen of the vessel. Count 2 requires an

additional stent to be added to the short limb, thus making a two piece graft that extends into both

branches of the vessel. The count 2 is patentably distinct from the Cragg '987 claims for this

reason.

5) Fogarty, application 08/463,836: All claims correspond to count 2.

# INTERFERENCE DIGEST

Interference No.	104,083		Paper No	15
Name,	George Goicoed	hea et al.		
Serial No	08/461,402	Patent No		
Title, BIF	URCATED ENDOLUMIN	AL PROSTHES	S	
Filed,	06/05/95			
Interference with		<u></u>		
	DECISION	ON MOTIONS		
The section to Child				
Examiner-in-Chief, _		*	Dated,	<u>:</u>
	•			
-d-Title-yle-				
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	FINAL I	DECISION		
	$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{A}}$	vorable		31
Board of Patent Appea	als and Interferences,	10Kable	Da	31,019
		<del></del>		•
Court,		Dated	·———	<del></del>
	REM	IARKS		
				<del></del>
		·		
	·			

This should be placed in each application or patent involved in interference in addition to the interference letters.